

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on October 26, 2004, in which the drawings were objected to; claims 2, 3, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; claims 1-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jackson et al.; and claims 6 and 8-10 were objected to as being allowable but dependent upon a rejected base claim. With this Amendment, the drawings and claims 1-7 and 9-11 are amended. Claims 1-11 remain pending in the present application.

Drawings

With this Amendment, figures 1a, 1b, and 1c have been amended to add the legend "Prior Art" to each drawing. A replacement drawing is submitted herewith. These amendments bring the drawings into compliance with MPEP § 608.02(g). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the drawings should accordingly be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 2, 3, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to differentiate organic active layer (4) referred to in claim 1, line 7 from active layer (6) referred to in claim 1, line 11. Claim 2 is amended to clarify that the organic active layer (4) has holes. Because the amendments to claim 1 and 2 clarify that the organic active layer (4) is referred to in claim 2, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection to claim 2 should be withdrawn.

In claim 3, the phrase "the said semiconductor material" at lines 1 and 2 is amended to "the semiconductor," which refers to the "field effect transistor sandwiched organic semiconductor" disclosed in claim 1, line 1. Based on this amendment to claim 3, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection to claim

3 should also be withdrawn. Claims 6, 7, and 10 have been amended for clarity and to make them consistent with amended claim 3. In addition, claims 4, 5, and 9 have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner rejected claim 11 for reciting the limitation “the said twin-Pc metal” in line 1 for lacking antecedent basis for the claim. Claim 11 depends from dependent claim 10. Claim 10, lines 3-4, disclose that “the said active layer (6) is comprised of at least one selected from a group consisting of *twin-Pc metal ...*” (Emphasis added). Thus, sufficient antecedent basis exists for claim 11 and the rejection to this claim should accordingly be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jackson et al. In order to reject a claim under § 102(e), the reference must teach each and every limitation of the claims. MPEP 2131; *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). As amended, claim 1 teaches a field effect transistor sandwiched organic semiconductor which includes an organic active layer (4) formed on the gate insulation layer (3). Jackson et al. fails to teach or fairly suggest a field effect transistor including an organic active layer formed on the gate insulation layer. Rather, in Fig. 3a, Jackson et al. teaches a thin-film transistor circuit including a p-channel *inorganic* active layer formed on the gate insulation layer. Therefore, the recited elements of claims 1 are not disclosed by the prior art and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 and 7 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jackson et al. Claims 2-5 and 7 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is not anticipated or otherwise taught by Jackson et al. Therefore, claims 2-5 and 7 also are not anticipated or otherwise taught by Jackson et al.

Objections to Claims

Claims 6 and 8-10 were objected to as being allowable but dependent upon a rejected base claim. In view of the foregoing, base claim 1, from which claims 6 and 8-10 depend, is now in a condition for allowance. Thus, claims 6 and 8-10 are allowable therewith.

First Named Inventor: Donghang Yan

Application No.: 10/645,642

-7-

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, all pending claims 1-11 are in condition for allowance.
Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 1/13/05

By: _____



Alan M. Koenck, Reg. No. 43,724
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580